

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/613,085	07/02/2003	William P. Blumenfeld-Kesler	WK-1-gw	6993	
7.	590 08/25/2004		EXAM	INER	
Michael I. Kroll			HAN, JASON		
171 Stillwell L Syosset, NY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			2875		
			DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004	DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			MV			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	10/613,085	BLUMENFELD-KESLE P.	ER, WILLIAM			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jason M Han	2875				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addres	ss			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the m earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r reply within the statutory minimum of thir riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this commu	unication.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0	2 July 2003.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 1 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.					
0) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	•	* * *				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. Tents have been received in A Poriority documents have been Treau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Sta	ge			
Attachment(s)						
1) ⊠ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152	2)			

Application/Control Number: 10/613,085 Page 2

Art Unit: 2875

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the inventor refers to a lamp having a base on one end and a concave reflector on a second end, which seems unreasonable. It is under the assumption of the examiner that said concave reflector is attached to said base on the same end. If this is incorrect, then please elucidate. Also, it is preferable to claim a lamp assembly rather than a guard for a lamp in the preamble. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soileau (U.S. Patent Number 4959762) in view of Alessio (U.S. Patent Number 3731657).

Application/Control Number: 10/613,085

Art Unit: 2875

4. With regards to Claim 1, Soileau discloses a luminaire comprising of a light source [Figure 1, (14)], a base [Figure 1, (12)], a concave reflector [Figure 1: (16)], a lip [Figure 1: (18)] disposed on an open side of said reflector, a screen guard [Figures 1 and 2: (22, 24); Column 2, Line 62 – Column 2, Line 3; Column 4, Lines 20-37] disposed on said lip, and a plurality of fasteners [Figure 1: (20)] disposed on said screen guard.

Page 3

Soileau does not disclose said luminaire disposed within a cage.

Alessio discloses an animal cage comprising a heat lamp [Figure 2: (15)].

It would have been obvious to incorporate the luminaire taught by Soileau in the animal cage of Alessio in order to provide light and warmth to an animal.

- 5. With regards to Claim 2, Soileau discloses a light bulb [Figure 1: (14); Column 2, Line 14].
- 6. With regards to Claim 3, Soileau discloses a screen guard that is substantially planar to fit said open end of said luminaire [Figures 2-4: (24); Column 3, Lines 4-7].
- 7. With regards to Claim 4, Soileau discloses a screen guard that is substantially circular to fit said open end of said luminaire [Figures 1-2: (22, 24); Column 3, Lines 4-7].
- 8. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soileau in view of Alessio as applied to Claims 1-4 above, and further in view of Blake (U.S. Patent Number 4516196).
- 9. With regards to Claim 5, Soileau in view of Alessio disclose a luminaire as described in Paragraph 4 above.

Soileau in view of Alessio does not specifically disclose said plurality of fasteners [Figure 1: (20)] disposed on said screen guard, wherein two of said fasteners are fixedly attached to said screen guard and where at least one of said fasteners is removably attached to said screen guard.

Blake discloses a luminaire hinge and latch whereby latches [Figures 1, 2, 3: (12)] are permanently attached to a refractor [Figures 1, 2, 3: (4)], which are further used in attaching said refractor to a reflector [Column 3, Lines 6-26]. Blake further discloses said hinge attachment [Figures 1, 4, 5: (11)] also located on said refractor, and which is separable and removable [Column 3, Lines 27-48].

It would have been obvious to modify Soileau in view of Alessio to incorporate the fasteners of Blake so as to allow easier accessibility to a light source. Also, said fasteners are fairly common in the art and provide the same means and function (e.g. attaching/removing a guard, shield, refractor, etc. to a reflector, enclosure, etc.) for the present application despite differing and various embodiments.

10. With regards to Claim 6, Blake discloses said latches [Figures 1,2, 3: (12)] being permanently attached to said refractor [Column 3, Lines 6-26]. As mentioned in the paragraph above, said fasteners are functionally equivalent and consideration to how they are attached is negligible. Further, Blake mentions that the latches are permanently attached to a plastic refractor. It is commonly known that welding is used to seal and attach metal objects, which may be a means for Blake if the invention was a metal mesh guard instead of a plastic refractor.

11. With regards to Claim 7, as described above the fasteners provide the same means and function, and differing embodiments are considered negligible. Regardless, Soileau discloses a U-shaped clip [Figure 1: (20)] attached to said luminaire.

- 12. With regards to Claim 8, Blake discloses said latches [Figures 1,2, 3: (12)] being permanently attached to said refractor [Column 3, Lines 6-26]. As mentioned above, said fasteners are functionally equivalent and consideration to how they are attached or of their structure are negligible. Further, Blake mentions that the latches are permanently attached to a plastic refractor. It is commonly known that welding is used to seal and attach metal objects, which may be a means for Blake if the invention was a metal mesh guard instead of a plastic refractor.
- 13. Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soileau in view of Alessio in further view of Blake as applied to Claims 5-8 above, and further in view of Roebken (U.S. Patent Number 2469412).

With regard to Claims 9 and 10, Soileau in view of Alessio in further view of Blake disclose a luminaire with a plurality of fasteners as a means for attaching a guard/refractor to a reflector, whereby one of said fasteners is removably attached.

Soileau in view of Alessio in further view of Blake does not specifically disclose a removably attached fastener comprising a pem-type fastener.

Roebken discloses a therapeutic lamp comprising of a bolt [Figure 3: (34)] having a head [Figure 3: (35)] at one end and a removable nut [Figure 3: (36)] at its other end. This bolt passes through an opening [Figure 3: (37)] in the reflector and an opening [Figure 3: (33)] in the screen guard [Figure 1: (24)] and serves to effectively secure the

Art Unit: 2875

reflector [Figure 3: (33)] in its proper position with respect to the guard and the source of light [Column 3, Lines 22-28].

It would have been obvious to modify Soileau in view of Alessio in further view of Blake to replace said removably attached fastener with Roebken's fastener, whereby a bolt with a removable nut may be used to firmly secure and attach a guard/refractor to a reflector. Said fastener of Roebken is considered functionally equivalent to a pem-type fastener.

- 14. With regards to Claim 11, Roebken discloses a deflector/reflector [Figure 3: (33)] disposed between a light source [Figure 3: (17)] and a screen guard [Figure 3: (31)], which serves to reflect heat and light that would normally be focused onto a specific area. Said light is also deflected into a concave reflector [Figures 5 and 6; see also Claims].
- 15. With regards to Claim 12, Roebken discloses a bolt [Figure 3: (34)] having a head [Figure 3: (35)] at one end and a removable nut [Figure 3: (36)] at its other end, whereby a deflector/reflector is connected to a screen guard. It is apparent that said bolt and nut are threaded for attachment.
- 16. With regards to Claim 13, Roebken discloses a bolt [Figure 3: (34)] having a head [Figure 3: (35)] at one end and a removable nut [Figure 3: (36)] at its other end. This bolt passes through an opening [Figure 3: (37)] in the reflector and an opening [Figure 3: (33)] in the screen guard [Figure 1: (24)] and serves to effectively secure the reflector [Figure 3: (33)] in its proper position with respect to the guard and the source of light [Column 3, Lines 22-28]. Please note that it is apparent that the bolt and nut are

Art Unit: 2875

threaded to correspond to one another, and said bolt further received in the center of said screen guard [see Figures 1 and 2].

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following references are further cited to show the state of art pertinent to this application:

Please note U.S. Patent Number 1369008 to Christen with respect to a U-Clip [Figure 3] whose primary function is to clamp two objects together; Please further note U.S. Patent Number 4840278 to Gelinas with respect to a pem fastener [Figure 2: (32); Column 3, Line 61], which is functionally equivalent to the fastener taught by Roebken;

- U.S. Patent Number 4654768 to Dryman et al.;
- U.S. Patent Number 1610609 to Johnston;
- U.S. Patent Number 2822462 to Price;
- U.S. Patent Number 4396221 to Morgan et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason M Han whose telephone number is (571) 272-2207. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on (571) 272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/613,085 Page 8

Art Unit: 2875

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JMH

JOHN ANTHONY WARD PRIMARY EXAMINER